

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
John H. Glenn Research Center
Lewis Field
21000 Brookpark Road
Cleveland, OH 44135-3191



SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT

FY14 CENTRAL COMPRESSED AIR SYSTEMS REPAIR, PHASE 1 (NNC14ZFD023R)

Procurement History

This procurement is for the repair of the Central Compressed Air System, Phase 1. The requirement includes the procurement, installation and activation of a five pound per second service air compressor and dryer system the Center's distributed service air system and the rewinding of a 5000 horsepower synchronous electric motor.

The synopsis was posted on April 1, 2014. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued May 19, 2014, through the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS). Eight amendments to the RFP were issued. Two proposals were received by the due date of July 16, 2014 from the following firms: North Bay Construction and Pinnacle Construction & Development Corp.

The RFP required the proposals to be submitted as follows:

Volumes
Volume I (Section 1): Past Performance Proposal
Part A - Prime Contractor List of Relevant Contracts
Part B - Major Subcontractor List of Relevant Contracts
Part C - Safety and Health / OSHA 300A Form
Part D - Past Performance Questionnaire
Volume I (Section 2): Price
Part A – Base Bid Price
Part B – Option 1
Part C – Option 2

Evaluation Process

The RFP included language detailing the evaluation process as outlined below. All proposals received in response to this solicitation were included in this process.

Step 1 - An initial review of proposals will be conducted to determine acceptability of the proposals in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All unacceptable proposals will be eliminated from further evaluation.

Step 2 – The evaluation team will evaluate the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor and Price Factors for all “acceptable” proposals. The past performance evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2), NFS 1815.305(a)(2), and Section M.4 of the solicitation. A pricing analysis of the proposal will be performed in accordance with FAR15.305(a)(1).

Step 3 - The evaluation team will report its evaluation results to the Source Selection Authority (SSA), who is responsible for making the source selection decision.

Evaluation Results

As the result of Step 1, all proposals were considered acceptable and included in Step 2.

As the result of Step 2, the Evaluation Team provided consensus findings in the area of Past Performance and Price which are indicated below:

North Bay Construction. (High Level of Confidence)

In the area of Relevant Experience and Past Performance, North Bay was rated with a High Level of Confidence. The proposal was considered to have one strength and one significant strength

Strength: The North Bay Construction team had multiple contracts similar in size and scope, which were considered pertinent to the solicitation requirements.

The contracts included: Upgrade to NASA GRC’s Icing Research Tunnel (\$5 Million over 1 year ended September 2011); NASA GRC PSL Icing Research Phase 1& 2(\$2 Million over 1 year ended August 2011); Akron Chlorine Dioxide Feed System Improvements (\$457K over 1 year-ended June 2014). North Bay’s subcontractor Herbst Electric Company listed 3 contracts ranging from \$23k to \$3.6 Million.

Significant Strength: North Bay had very good to excellent past performance ratings on contacts considered pertinent to the anticipated contract effort.

North Bay and their primary sub were rated Excellent (53%), Very Good (33%), and Good (13%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires. The provided written comments fully corroborated the numerical scores..

In the area of Price, North Bay submitted a total price, including all options, of \$4,835,030. This was lower than the Government’s IGCE of \$5,300,000. The North Bay Price was also substantially lower than the other offeror’s proposed price. In the Government’s review of the proposed price and in consideration of North Bay’s approach to accomplish the work effort, the Government did not consider the price unrealistically lower and a risk to contract performance.

Pinnacle Construction & Development Corp. (High Level of Confidence)

Strength: The Pinnacle Construction & Development Corp. team had multiple contracts similar in size and scope, which are considered pertinent to solicitation requirements.

They include NASA GRC B301 Boiler Design Build (\$1.4 Million over 1 year – ended December 2012); NASA GRC Altitude Wind Tunnel (\$4.4 Million over 1 year – ended December 2012); NASA Plum Brook LN2 Supply (\$700K over 3 years –ends December 2012). Pinnacle's subcontractors Marvin W. Mielke, Inc. and ESI, Inc. listed 3 contracts ranging \$600k to \$3 Million.

Significant Strength: The Pinnacle Team had very good to excellent past performance ratings on contacts considered pertinent to the anticipated contract effort.

Pinnacle and their primary subs were rated Excellent (70%), Very Good (19%), and Good (10%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires. The provided written comments fully corroborated the numerical scores.

In the area of Price, Pinnacle submitted a total price, including all options, which was substantially higher than North Bay. The price was also moderately higher than the Government's IGCE of \$5,300,000. In the Government's review of the proposed price, the Government did not consider the price to be a risk to contract performance.

Selection Review

On August 13, 2014, a Source Selection Review was made to me in my capacity as the Source Selection Authority (SSA), which detailed the findings of the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC). In addition to myself, the Source Selection Review was attended by members of the SEC. During the meeting, the overall evaluation process and findings on Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Price were presented and discussed. Additionally, during the review, I provided the SEC with my independent judgment relative to the findings and asked questions regarding the information presented. The review concluded with my decision, which is detailed in this Source Selection Statement.

Selection Decision

I have reviewed the information presented by the SEC. I understand the evaluation process undertaken and the findings presented. I agree with the findings as presented as well as the approach to derive the findings. I understand that the solicitation required Relevant Experience and Past Performance information as well as Pricing information only. I further understand that these two factors are equal in importance.

In Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor, I find that North Bay and Pinnacle were both rated at a High Level of Confidence. Both proposals received one significant strength and one strength. The significant strengths for both firms were in the area of performance with both firms having a highly successful record of performance at GRC. I was impressed with their overall consistent rating from current and former clients. Both firms also received a strength for the pertinence of prior contract to the anticipated contract effort. I consider the identified strengths for both firms in this Factor to be strong indicator of future successful contract performance. Based on the information provided, I do not find any meaningful discriminators in the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor amongst the two offerors and consider both firms to be essentially equal in this Factor.

In the area of Price, I understand the offeror's price reflects the total price for the base and options. I note North Bay's proposed price of \$4,835,030 is substantially lower than Pinnacle's proposed price and lower than the IGCE of approximately \$5.3M. I questioned the Committee on any performance risk relative to a proposed price lower than the IGCE and the committee responded that the IGCE was based

on an assumption of how the work would be performed with multiple subcontractors. The North Bay approach to complete the effort was different than the IGCE assumptions and represented a lower price. I therefore conclude there was no additional performance risk due to the lower North Bay price. Due to the substantially lower proposed price, I consider North Bay to have a distinct advantage in this Factor

In making my final decision, I understand the Relevant Experience and Performance Factor and Price Factor are equal in importance. I find that North Bay and Pinnacle were both rated at a High Level of Confidence in the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor. Both firms have a successful performance record at GRC. I find no meaningful discriminators between the two firms in this Factor and thereby find them to be essentially equal in this Factor.

In the area of Price, I find North Bay to have provided a substantially lower price, which is advantageous to the Government. I find this to be a meaningful discriminator in the two proposals and provides a distinct advantage to the Government. Furthermore, I do not consider this lower price to be a risk to successful contract performance.

Therefore, I select North Bay Construction to perform the requirements related to Request for Proposal NNC14ZFD023R.



Ronald Sepesi
Source Selection Authority

August 22, 2014
Date